



ATTACHMENT A

REMARKS

First, it is noted that, in order to expedite the prosecution, claim 1 has been amended to even more clearly distinguish over the cited references. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the processor and the at least one peripheral both process all types of said input data codes. This clearly contrasts with the Veil system wherein sensitive data is processed in the coprocessor and nonsensitive data is processed in the computer host. Thus, the recitation that both the processor and computing peripheral process all types of input data codes (albeit in a different way) further distinguish from Veil. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has misinterpreted the argument made in this regard in the last sentence in the first paragraph on page 3 and, again, it is respectfully submitted that the Veil patent does not disclose the feature in question.

More generally, the Examiner continues to argue that applicants "still have failed to explicitly identify specific claim limitations, which would define a patentable distinction over prior arts" (emphasis in the original). It is respectfully submitted that the applicant has indeed identified such specific claim limitations and it is the Examiner who has not responded to this identification. In this regard, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has, in essence, simply quoted from the Abstract of the Veil patent without specifically applying the patent to the claims. The subject matter to which the Examiner has made reference includes such teachings as "[s]mart card require built-in function only for storing sensitive data including account number and private key" and "[s]mart cards carry biometric data for reliable proof of participation and cardholder verification." It is respectfully submitted that these teachings and the others to which the Examiner has referred, which are basically directed to the restricting of access by the host computer to the data transmitted through the coprocessor, are simply not relevant to the present invention as claimed. The only other citation to the Veil reference concerns "col 7 line 28 to col. 11 line 44" and this very long passage, again, does not include a teaching of the present invention as claimed. Thus, if the Examiner intends to pursue the rejection of the claims based on the Veil patent, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner point out exactly how the claims are being read on the reference rather than

simply quoting from the Abstract and pointing to the long passage extending between columns 7 and 11. To the extent that the Examiner is still relying on the application of Veil to the claims as set forth in the Office Action mailed on August 9, 2005, it is respectfully submitted that while applicant has pointed out why this reading of the claims on Veil is inappropriate, the Examiner, as set forth above, has not specifically responded to these arguments.

Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

END REMARKS